

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

No. 73-765

INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION,
UPPER SOUTH DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO, *Petitioner*

v.

QUALITY MANUFACTURING COMPANY AND
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals
For The Fourth Circuit

No. 73-1363

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, *Petitioner*

v.

J. WEINGARTEN, INC.

On Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

BRIEF OF PETITIONER IN NO. 73-765 IN OPPOSITION TO
MOTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR LEAVE
TO FILE BRIEF AS AMICUS CURIAE

MAX ZIMNY

1710 Broadway
New York, New York 10019

BERNARD DUNAU

912 Dupont Circle Bldg., N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

BERNARD RUBENSTEIN

BERNARD P. JEWELER

10 Light Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Attorneys for Petitioner in
No. 73-765



IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1974

No. 73-765

INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION,
UPPER SOUTH DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO, *Petitioner*

v.

QUALITY MANUFACTURING COMPANY AND
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals
For The Fourth Circuit

No. 73-1363

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, *Petitioner*

v.

J. WEINGARTEN, INC.

On Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

BRIEF OF PETITIONER IN NO. 73-765 IN OPPOSITION TO
MOTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR LEAVE
TO FILE BRIEF AS AMICUS CURIAE

Petitioner in No. 73-765 opposes the motion of the
Chamber of Commerce for leave to file a brief as
amicus curiae in support of the position of Quality

Manufacturing Company in No. 73-765 and of J. Weingarten, Inc. in No. 73-1363. The petitions for writs of certiorari in each case were granted on the same day (April 29, 1974), present a common question, and were "set for oral argument in tandem."

The proffered *amicus* brief is altogether out of time. Rule 42(2) of this Court's Rules provides that an *amicus* brief shall be "presented within the time allowed for the filing of the brief of the party supported." Quality and Weingarten each filed their briefs on August 12, 1974. The *amicus* brief and the attached motion for leave to file it were not submitted until September 16, 1974, more than a month after the briefs of the parties to be supported had already been filed.

No reason justifying so untimely a filing is given. The petitions were granted on April 29, 1974, more than four and one-half months ago, and the briefs of the parties to be supported were filed August 12, 1974, more than a month ago. There was thus ample opportunity to present a timely brief.

While we fully appreciate the need to accommodate busy counsel, no reason is stated in the motion to extenuate the untimeliness of the brief. On the contrary, untimeliness has become a litigating habit with the Chamber of Commerce.¹ Respect for the obligation to achieve moderate compliance with the requirements of Rule 42(2) can only be inculcated by denying

¹ See pages 3-4 of the Memorandum In Opposition To Motion Of Chamber of Commerce For Leave To File Brief *Amicus Curiae* in *Florida Power & Light Co. v. I.B.E.W.*, and *N.L.R.B. v. I.B.E.W.*, Nos. 73-556 and 73-795. We are informed that the Chamber's motion to file an out-of-time *amicus* brief was denied in those cases.

habitual motions, unexplained and unjustified, for leave to file untimely *amicus* briefs.

For these reasons the notion for leave to file a brief as *amicus curiae* should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

MAX ZIMNY

1710 Broadway

New York, New York 10019

BERNARD DUNAU

912 Dupont Circle Bldg., N.W.

Washington, D. C. 20036

BERNARD RUBENSTEIN

BERNARD P. JEWELER

10 Light Street

Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Attorneys for Petitioner in

No. 73-765

September, 1974 °